

file Leak Log 75

March 24, 1983

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 4059

A particularly dangerous practice, according to the guide for physicians, is that of placing a bag over the head to increase the concentration of inhaled vapor.

"Users describe the sensations evoked by inhalants as euphoria and excitement, accompanied by a feeling that 'something wonderful is about to happen,'" the publication said.

What may actually happen, drug experts say, is sudden death.

FARMERS BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION

• Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, I have taken the opportunity on several occasions during this past year to call to the attention of my colleagues and the public of the tremendous contribution made by U.S. farmers in this country's battle against inflation. To a significant extent our victory over inflation has been won, at great cost, by the American farmer. Mr. President, during the last 12 months the price index of food consumed at home has risen but 0.8 percent—less than one-quarter the rate of increase in the consumer price index for all commodities and services. Why? While the costs of processing, packing, marketing and transporting food rose 5 percent during 1982, prices received by farmers for wheat dropped over 9 percent, corn prices plunged almost 19 percent, soybean prices declined over 16 percent, the price of potatoes down almost 27 percent and grapefruit prices were off 40 percent. And, with the exception of hogs, all prices received by farmers for livestock and livestock products, including poultry, declined during 1982.

And now, largely because of the resounding success of the payment-in-kind program, we are beginning to hear the whimpers which, we can all be assured, will build to cry of terror of skyrocketing food costs and the rapacious, greedy and heartless character of the "robber-baron in bib overalls."

I think it important, Mr. President, that we place in the public record at this time the relationship between the prices received by farmers for their products and the prices paid by consumers for these products in a processed, edible condition. For example, we should all take note that even should the price paid to farmers for food grains double, the retail price of cereal and bakery products should only rise 12 percent; only 12 cents of every retail dollar spend for cereal and bakery products goes to the farmer. In fact the farmer gets less than 35 percent of the retail cost of a market basket of food.

I ask that a table in this connection be printed in the RECORD.

The table follows:

Percent farm value of retail food costs, 1982	
	Percent
Market basket	34.6
Meat products	50.2
Dairy products	49.6
Poultry	50.9

Percent farm value of retail food costs, 1982—Continued

	Percent
Eggs	62.7
Cereal and bakery products	12.0
Fresh fruits	31.4
Fresh vegetables	30.8

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, words fail me in describing how disgusted I get listening to people cheer the economic recovery of the automobile industry, steel, housing, chemicals, construction and then lash out against the farmer for sharing in that economic recovery.

Mr. President, agriculture is in desperate need and deserving of an economic recovery. Let us all welcome and applaud it. ●

CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY OF LaSALLE MILITARY ACADEMY

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise in honor of the centennial birthday of LaSalle Military Academy in Oakdale, N.Y.

LaSalle Military Academy was founded in New York State by the Brothers of the Christian Schools. It was founded in Westchester County, but was relocated in 1926 to its present 172-acre estate on Long Island. The move to the new campus was fraught with difficulty as a construction workers strike halted the building of the scholastic and dormitory structure, thereby forcing the corps of cadets to spend the fall of 1927 sleeping in tents on the parade grounds.

Despite occasional setbacks LaSalle continued to grow during the 1930's. In 1935 it joined the Mid-Atlantic States Association and was awarded an Honor Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) rating by the U.S. Army Department. Today, the school has a military honor school designation which gives it the right to nominate three of its graduates to each of the National Service Academies.

However, there is more to LaSalle Military Academy than the pomp and grandeur of its military parades, drills and ceremonies. Its academic program covers a wide variety of subjects, from English, mathematics, science, history and languages to computers and science research program. The present enrollment is 349 students. Last June 86 seniors graduated, 84 of whom went on to study at colleges and universities throughout this Nation.

Mr. President, LaSalle Military Academy is an example of a school which has survived a particularly trying time for both private boarding and military schools. Despite adversity it survived. It provides an excellent basic education for its students adding military discipline and a Christian philosophy. LaSalle's perspective on education is best summarized by Headmaster McKenery's comment, "self-discipline, stick-to-it-iveness, and Christian love always will be a part of a good LaSalle student."

Mr. President, I commend LaSalle on its 100th birthday and hope that

they will still be educating young men for a hundred more years. ●

PREVENTING GOVERNMENT INFORMATION LEAKS

• Mr. HART. Mr. President, in its efforts to control leaks, the Reagan administration has plugged little but free speech. The National Security Council's March 11 directive stating that anyone in any part of the Government who handles sensitive information will have to submit every speech or manuscript in entirety for review represents a significant threat to an important American tradition: the belief that information about Government activities must be freely discussed if we are to choose the wisest policy. Government employees are promised an extensive regime of censorship and prior restraint on speech and publication if the directive is enforced as intended. In fact the directive brings us closer to an "official secrets act": A solution popular in other nations, but foreign to our own constitutional traditions.

As one who has spent 8 years on the Senate Armed Services Committee and 4 years on Senate Intelligence Committees, I know firsthand the importance of secrecy with regard to truly sensitive material. As one who aspires to be president, I am sympathetic to the need to control leaks of information which cause identifiable damage to our national security. But the new National Security Council directive is so broadly drawn it fails to distinguish between speech and publication which is properly classified and should remain so, and speech and publication which legitimately enlightens public debate and causes no injury to our national security.

The directive could be applied to any Government employee in possession of a security clearance. Screening would be required after the employee leaves Government, possibly for the rest of the employee's life. If the order had been in effect in previous administrations—former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger would have had to clear his memoirs, speeches, and articles. Former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance would have to clear his current articles on defense policy. Any future President could use this procedure to delay publication, to stifle criticism, to excise critical or embarrassing information on the grounds that such information should remain classified. Such a policy is not what the authors of the Bill of Rights had in mind when they wrote the first amendment—nor is this policy likely to stimulate Government officials to fully disseminate materials on the leading issues of the day. The cost will come in lessened public awareness of public affairs.

We can be sure that this directive will spawn an enormous bureaucracy dedicated to censorship—as all departments and bureaus in any way con-

IE

S 4060

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 24, 1983

nected with national security are forced to enter the business of clearing material for review. Another obvious result of the directive is a certain proliferation of litigation.

As if this new censorship system were not enough, the directive requires employees to submit to polygraph tests during investigations or face possible dismissal from employment. It is widely known that lie-detector tests are inherently unreliable. To make them compulsory poses serious threats to constitutional rights of due process of law.

This new directive is the latest in a series of Reagan administration threats to free speech. President Reagan should rescind this directive. If he does not, then the Congress should take action. The appropriate Senate committee should schedule hearings as soon as possible to investigate the justification for this new secrecy system. As President, I would rescind this order to preserve the balance between the interests of national security and the interests of the healthy debate that is the key to a free society. ●

TOWARD A MORE AGGRESSIVE
TRADE POLICY

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I would like to draw Senators' attention to an article by Joseph E. Connor, chairman of Price Waterhouse, entitled, "Let's Not Join the Rush to Protectionism."

Mr. Connor takes an entirely positive approach to the problem of growing world protectionism which emphasizes the need for the United States to do a better job of protecting its international economic interests without necessarily resorting to protectionism or retreating to economic isolationism.

Mr. Connor makes three basic points. First, he endorses full utilization of all existing multilateral and domestic mechanisms for upholding U.S. trade rights. Second, he proposes expansion of GATT to cover investments, trade in services, and high technology goods. Third, he encourages vigorous U.S. support for private sector expansion in export trade and overseas investment.

I agree with Joseph Connor, that we as a country cannot be shortsighted in our approach to trade policies. I welcome these constructive proposals and encourage further thought on these ideas. I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

LET'S NOT JOIN THE RUSH TO PROTECTIONISM
(By Joseph E. Connor)

There are those who say that the United States should wake up and recognize that free trade is already a casualty of international economic hard times, and accordingly, join the rush to protectionism. I don't agree.

We must be leaders in preserving and expanding the multilateral system, not followers in destroying it. The United States should continue its current policy of seeking liberalization of foreign markets rather

than raising barriers in our own. But, as we do so, so we must become much tougher in protecting our trade rights from being undermined by the unfair and restrictive practices of others.

Protective barriers are on the rise. The protectionist trend is particularly evident regarding the service sector and foreign direct investments. Moreover, international agreements such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) are being violated.

In this environment it would be inviting, albeit shortsighted, to retreat to economic isolationism. We should resist this temptation. Instead, I believe the United States must do a better job of protecting its international economic interest without resorting to protectionism. Here's one approach:

First, full utilization of all existing multilateral and domestic mechanisms for upholding U.S. trade rights. We should continue to play by the international rules and insist that our trading partners do likewise. When they do not, we should be aggressive in utilizing all instruments at our disposal to obtain redress. For instance, in cases where the U.S. encounters barriers erected by GATT signatories which are illegal under the Agreements, we should seek relief through the GATT process for resolving trade disputes and leave no stone unturned in working within the system.

On the domestic front, one of the most important tools we have is Section 301 of the 1974 Trade Act, under which the President is authorized to "enforce the rights of the United States under any trade agreement," and act to curtail any foreign trade practice which is "unjustifiable, unreasonable or discriminatory and burdens or restricts United States commerce."

In the past, neither government nor business has been sufficiently aggressive in taking action under Section 301. This law is on the books. Let's use it! If it needs strengthening, let's do it.

Second, expansion of GATT to cover investments, trade in services, and high technology goods. Currently, GATT is applicable only to goods. No framework of multinational trade agreements can be truly effective unless it covers services and investments. Not only are they important in their own right; they also support and facilitate trade in goods.

The old scenario that threatens to disrupt international trade in goods is now being repeated for trade in services, as country after country erects barriers which restrict the ability of foreign service firms to sell in the domestic market or establish local facilities. A country may, for instance, simply prohibit the establishment of local operations by foreign service firms. Or it may be more subtle and make the licensing and approval procedures for foreign service firms so complex and lengthy that it's not worth their while to make the attempt.

Similar problems abound regarding foreign investments. In a recent 73-nation study, my firm found that barriers to foreign investment are on the rise in many countries, including restrictions as to ownership, exchange controls, repatriations or remittances, and performance requirements.

Perhaps the most intense and insidious barriers to trade and investment exist in the fiercely competitive areas of "high technology." The U.S. position in world markets for high tech products and services is declining largely because of barriers impeding access to foreign markets and domestic policies to promote industrial growth, particularly through industry targeting. These practices must be vigorously challenged. But, we should do so by aggressively seeking ex-

panded access to foreign markets rather than closing our markets.

Moreover, while the GATT Ministerial meeting last November was a disappointment, it was not a failure. We should not shrink from our resolve to seek an extension of GATT principles and procedures to services, investments and high technology. Meanwhile, bilateral negotiation of trade agreements in these areas should be actively pursued.

Third, vigorous support for the private sector in expanding export trade and overseas investment. The U.S. Government should do everything in its power, within the limits of international agreements, to promote and facilitate the expansion of U.S. exports of goods and services and investments. Businesses in many foreign countries receive such support. We should do no less.

International trade is far too important to our nation's international economic competitiveness to be a victim of governmental neglect. Promotion and support of U.S. business involvement in international trade by government agencies is now inadequate and must be improved.

Congress also could help. For starters, Congress could enact the so-called "reciprocity" legislation to strengthen our government's hand in dealing with the predatory practices of other nations, and to provide clear authority for the President to negotiate new agreements regarding trade in services, high technology products and foreign investment. It could also clarify the ambiguities in the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, in view of its chilling effect on export trade. And Congress could provide new funding authority for the Export-Import Bank to enhance its ability to support our export trade.

Persistent unfair trade practices may force the United States to resort to protective measures in some cases. But, let's work with the system we have before we take any actions that may lead to its eventual destruction. Restraint, restriction, and reactionary competitive practices by any affected party inevitably will result in a retaliatory response. Surely, in the long run, this is a waste of effort to all.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, on March 25, we commemorate the 65th anniversary of the establishment of Byelorussian Democratic Republic by the Byelorussian National Council which met at Minsk.

The roots of independence and nationalism grow deep in the soil of Byelorussia; the Byelorussian principalities of Polotsk, Smolinsk, and Turor served as the core of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In 1569, the Grand Duchy and Poland were joined to form a commonwealth. The partition of the commonwealth between 1772 and 1795 brought Byelorussia into the Russian Empire. During this period, the people of Byelorussia were subjected to the Czarist policy of russification which was designed to eliminate their unique culture. In 1863, a massive anti-Russian uprising was led by Kastus Kalinowski. This significant event clearly demonstrated the desire of the Byelorussian people to live in peace. Their struggle for independence continued.